



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

81

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/668,734 | 09/23/2003 | John J. Toben | 6006-141-1 | 2477 |
| 7590 | 04/26/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| Nicholas J. Tuccillo, Esq. McCormick, Paulding & Huber LLP CityPlace II 185 Asylum Street Hartford, CT 06103 | | | GARCIA, ERNESTO | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3679 | |
| DATE MAILED: 04/26/2005 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/668,734 | TOBEN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Ernesto Garcia | 3679 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2003.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-11 and 17-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 20 and 21 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1 and 12-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/23/03.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------|
| I. Figures 2-4 | II. Figures 5-7 |
| III. Figures 8 and 9 | IV. Figure 10 |

Note: Figure 1 is prior art.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include

all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. See MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Nicholas J. Tuccillo on April 13, 2005 a provisional election was made without oral traverse to prosecute the invention of Species I, claims 1, 12-16, 20 and 21. Applicant in replying to this Office action must make affirmation of this election. Claims 2-11 and 17-19 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show in Figure 3 the angle α between 10 to 60 degrees as described in paragraph 036 in lines 1-2 of the specification and in claim 14. Note: Figure 3 shows an angle α of 135 degrees or 145 degrees. Furthermore, since the figures are cross-sectional views, cross-hatching is missing in all the drawings.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended". If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct

any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities:
regarding claim 1, --end-- needs to be inserted after "male" in lines 7 and 9; and,
regarding claim 20, "wherein" in line 6 should be deleted. Appropriate correction
is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1 and 12, the metes and bounds of the claims is unclear. The preamble states that the invention is a seam "for ductwork having a male end portion integrally formed at a distal end of a duct wall". However, the body of the claim positively claims the duct wall of the ductwork, e.g., "a female end portion integrally

formed at another distal end of said duct wall" in lines 3-4. Therefore, it is unclear whether the seam is claimed alone or in combination with duct wall of the ductwork along with the male end portion integrally formed at a distal end of a duct wall. For purposes of examination, the examiner has considered the combination. Furthermore, shouldn't the ductwork be comprised of a duct wall?

Regarding claims 13-15, these claims depend from claim 1 and therefore are indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Huffel, 2,086,143 (see marked-up attachment).

Regarding claim 1, as best understood, Van Huffel discloses, in Figure 5, a seam comprising a duct wall 3, a male end portion **A9**, and a female end portion **A1**. The male end portion **A9** is integrally formed at a distal end of the duct wall 3. The female end portion **A1** is integrally formed at another distal end of the duct wall 3. The female

end portion **A1** includes a first fold **A4** and a second fold **A5**. The first fold **A4** and the second fold **A5** defines a female groove **A6**. A distal end **A7** of the second fold **A5** is bent transverse to the female groove **A6** prior to the male end portion **A9** being inserted into the female groove **A6**.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 12-16, as best understood, would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Claims 20 and 21 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

regarding claims 12 and 20, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest a seam, in combination with a duct wall of a ductwork, comprising a third fold beginning substantially adjacent to a break point and extending substantially parallel to the duct wall; the European patent, EP-71,586, teaches the third fold extending substantially coaxial to the duct wall and there is no suggestion to extend the third fold substantially parallel to the duct wall; furthermore, the manufacture of the seam, claim 20, is also not suggested;

regarding claims 13-16, these claims depend from claim 12; and,
regarding claim 21, this claim depends from claim 20.

Conclusion

The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Caldwell, 354,390, shows a similar seam.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ernesto Garcia whose telephone number is 703-272-7083. The examiner can normally be reached from 9:30-5:30. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9326 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel P. Stodola can be reached on 703-308-2686. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 3679

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EJ.



E.G.

April 15, 2005

Attachment: one marked-up page of Van Huffel, 2,086,143

DANIEL P. STODOLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Van Huffel, 2,086,143

